UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/533,781	03/24/2000	Sriram Ramani	HP10992784	2479

22879	7590	05/07/2004

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
BASEHOAR, ADAM L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 05/07/2004

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.		**Applicant(s)**
Office Action Summary	09/533,781		RAMANI ET AL.
	Examiner		**Art Unit**
	Adam L Basehoar		2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _10 February 2004_ .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
    closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-20_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-20_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _24 March 2000_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
        application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .	6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: the Amendment filled on 02/10/04 to the

original application filed on 03/24/00.

2.   Claims 1-20 remain rejected in this case. Claims 1, 11, and 18 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 1-6, 8-9, 11-15, 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Jones et al (US: 6,493,731 12/10/02).

-In regard to independent claims 1, 11, and 18, Jones et al teach a first set of data fields

(Fig. 4: 407) of the document task (parent task) with a document resource (sub-identifier) field

(Fig. 4: 403 & 408), wherein metadata fills the fields of the first set of data fields and wherein

the sub-identifier field identifies secondary documents linking metadata in the secondary

documents to the source document task. Jones et al do not specifically teach wherein changes to

the secondary documents update the data fields in the parent document task and presenting it to

the user. Jones et al do teach wherein the secondary document metadata is embedded in the

parent document task (column 6, lines 22-30)(Fig. 4: 409). Thus it would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, that changes in metadata of the

secondary documents would be displayed in the parent document transaction viewable by the

user.

-In regard to dependent claim 2, Jones et al teach wherein the document task (parent task)

has a first set of data fields and a first set of metadata (Fig. 4: 407).

-In regard to dependent claims 3, 4, 12, and 13, Jones et al teach wherein the sub-

identifier field links the parent document task to secondary document task (Fig. 4) which

comprises a second set of data fields and a second set of metadata (Fig. 4: 411) that represent the

attributes of the secondary document, where changes in the secondary document would be

reflected in the parent document task through the link. Jones et al further teach wherein the

second set of metadata comprises relational data that corresponds to the first set of data fields

(Fig. 4: 407 corresponds to 411) and wherein a change to the corresponding metadata field is

accomplished by filling the corresponding metadata field with metadata.

-In regard to dependent claim 5, Jones et al wherein the metadata of the parent document

task is stored on a computer (repository) (Fig. 11) and wherein the document management

system accessed the data by a processor (core).

-In regard to dependent claim 6, Jones et al teach wherein the document management

system processor (core) can automatically create typed links between the documents (parent

document task and secondary documents)(column 8, lines 46-50) and populates the contents data

field with the location and local name of the generated secondary document (column 6, lines 30-

40).

-In regard to dependent claims 8 and 19, Jones et al teach when the task document is set

to "completed," then the operators performing other tasks are then granted permission to view

the task document and metadata (column 8, lines 14-17), wherein operator (client) requests to

access and view the task document was permitted only when the task document was set to

"completed." Jones et al do not teach having a field that includes permissions about who may

access the document. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention, to have had another data field listing said other operators (clients) who would be

given permission of the task document when it was "completed", because it would inform said

operators when and who could view the task documents and prevent unnecessary requests from

operators whom could not get permission.

-In regard to dependent claim 9, Jones et al teach a second sub-identifier that includes

metadata that represents the attributes of the second secondary document (Fig. 4: 408: "Notes

from Meeting"), wherein data in the second secondary document is linked to the parent

document task.

-In regard to dependent claim 14, Jones et al teach populating the sub-identifier fields

with metadata that identifies the secondary documents (Fig. 4: 411), and populating the identifier

fields with metadata that identifies the parent document task (Fig. 4: 407).

-In regard to dependent claim 15, Jones et al teach wherein the parent and secondary

documents are stored in computer memory (repository) and whereby the first and second set of

metadata maybe accessed (Fig. 3).

5.   Claims 7 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones et

al (US: 6,493,731 12/10/02) in view of W3C's "XML 1.0", 02/10/98

http://www.w3.org/TR/1998/REC-xml-19980210#sec-intro.

-In regard to dependent claims 7 and 20, Jones et al teach wherein documents can be web

pages (column 6, 37-39) or documents located on other servers (Fig. 11). Jones et al do not

teacher wherein the documents are capable of being displayed using a web browser. It would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, because it was

well known in the art for web browsers to be used to display web pages and documents (pages)

located on other servers. Jones et al also do not teach wherein the documents are written in

extensible markup language. W3C teaches that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of the invention, to have written the documents in XML, because XML

documents were known to be easy to write and process for web based applications (Intro).

6.   Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones et al (US:

6,493,731 12/10/02) in further view Tabb et al (US: 6,493,731 02/11/97).

-In regard to dependent claim 10, Jones et al do not teach wherein the parent document

task is a purchase order and one of the secondary documents is a sales order. Tabb et al teach a

similar document management system wherein the parent document task is a purchase order and

a linking secondary document is the sales order (Fig. 7B). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, for Jones et al to have displayed linked

purchase and sales orders, because Tabb et al teach by doing so users can be kept up to date on

the status of their purchase orders.

7.   Claims 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones et

al (US: 6,493,731 12/10/02) in view of "XML Programming With C++", Fabio Arciniegas A.,

November 17, 1999, http://www.xml.com/pub/a/1999/11/cplus/.

-In regard to dependent claims 16 and 17, Jones et al and W3C do not teach wherein the

step of creating involves XML supported code. Arciniegas teaches that C++ was a popular

programming language for many XML related efforts (Section: Intro). It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, for Jones et al to have

submitted C++ containing the first set of data fields and metadata (Fig. 4), because Arciniegas

teaches that C++ is well suited for XML processing in terms of availability, size and complexity

of code, conformance, portability, and performance (Section: Conclusion).

Response to Arguments

8.   Applicant's arguments filed 02/10/04 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

-In regard to independent claims 1, 11, and 18, Applicant's main argument is that Jones

does not disclose or suggest the amended feature that the data generated by the secondary

transaction is used to update the active document. The examiner disagrees with the Applicant's

argument that the obviousness rejection is unfounded. The examiner notes that Jones teaches

that while an active document task is developed secondary transaction document data is linked to

the active document, wherein the resource secondary transaction acts as metadata towards the

active document task (column 3, lines 1-12). This implies that any data generated (i.e. modified)

at the secondary transaction document resource level would update the active document via their

linked relationship. In addition, as noted above in the rejection to the claims, the Jones reference

implies that it would have been obvious because of metadata stored in fields on the active

document incorporated embedded secondary document metadata. Thus any changes generated

by the secondary document resources would obviously effect/update the parent active document

task. For example, a parent task document could rely upon a resource object containing stored

personal contact information related to the task (column 5, lines 33-37). If said stored personal

information was updated to reflect changes in a person's contact information, said newly

generated information would be available at the parent task via the linked data (column 6, lines

47-51).

-In regard to the argument that Jones does not relate to transactions to business processes

conducted over the internet or for systems for improving the sharing and accessing of

information regarding transactions, the examiner notes that these features upon which applicant

relies are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the

specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van

Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). The examiner also wishes to point

out that the embodiment of Jones et al includes tracking and viewing documents used for

supporting business processes over a network to provided information to the right person at the

right time (column 1, 15-38).

Conclusion

9.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

US: 6,463,420	10-2002	Guidice et al.
US: 6,220,509	04-2001	Byford

10.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

11.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Adam L Basehoar whose telephone number is (703) 305-7212.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 7:30am - 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on (703) 308-5186. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ALB

JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER